Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/944,317	PARAGIOS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher L. Lavin	2624
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>		
(1) <u>Christopher L. Lavin</u> .	(3)	
(2) Donald B. Paschburg (reg. No. 33,753).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 August 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 1-16		
Prior art documents discussed: Kamijo		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	E GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	/AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	tion. The examiner will provide a we parate record of the substance of	ritten summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representative	e Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 09/944,317

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative as the examiner felt that after the last amendment the applicant was very close to allowable material. The examiner believed that based on specification page 9 there had been a slight mistake in the drafting of the claims. In particular there was a call for a background reference frame, where the spec called for a background reference model. By making this change and clearly stating that the model consisted of a plurality of states the applicant overcame all of the prior art. The applicant agreed to these changes, which can be seen in the examiner's amendment.